



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/513,652	02/25/2000	James G. Hanko	83000.1134;P4725/ARG	6825

7590 07/17/2003

Brian M. Berliner, Esq.
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	13

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/513,652	Applicant(s) HANKO ET AL. <i>P29</i>
	Examiner Tammy T Nguyen	Art Unit 2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 20-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 20-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____ .

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20591
www.uspto.gov

Detailed Office Action

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on **May 13, 2003**
2. Claims 1-19 are canceled without prejudice.
3. Claims 20-39 are newly added
4. Applicants are required to fill in the blank on page number 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Claim 1, 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant required to state out how the user stateless DTU, where is the location of filter resource and a missing connection claim limitations.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 20-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4, 11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spilo et al., (hereinafter Spilo) U.S. Patent No. 6,298,422 in view of Susai et al., (hereinafter Susai) U.S. Patent No. 6,411,986.

9. As to claim 20, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of improving access to one or more resources on a client server comprising: serving a plurality of applications from said client server to a stateless Desktop Unit (DTU) (col. 3, lines 35-47, and col.4, lines 1-13); determining when an application served from said client server to said stateless DTU should become inactive (col.4, lines 38-67); sending a first signal to said application served from said client server to indicate that said application should stop or reduce consuming said one or more resources on said client server (col.5, lines 40-60, and col.4, lines 50-67); and sending a second signal (col.4, lines 50-60) to said application served from said client server to indicate that said application should resume or increase consuming said one or more resources on said client server (col.1, lines 30-37). Spilo does not teach determining when said application

served from said client server should resume activity. However, Susai teaches the determining when said application served from client server should resume activity (col.4, lines 16-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the invention to combine the teachings of Spilo and to have an application served from client server should resume activity because it would have an efficient that can provide automatically function that can return to or begin again after interruption.

10. As to claim 21, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein determining when said application should become inactive comprises determining when a session associated with a user is no longer active by identifying when said stateless DTU is disassociated with said session (col.4, lines 8-13)

11. As to claim 22, teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said client server maintains said session with said user when user said user is disconnected with said stateless DTU (col.6, lines 9-37).

12. As to claim 23, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said client server is shared by a plurality of stateless DTUs and wherein said determining when said application should resume activity comprises determining when said session becomes active by identifying when any stateless DTU of said plurality of stateless DTUs becomes re-associated with said session (col.5, lines 1-21).

13. As to claim 25, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said first and second signals are sent by server (col.13, lines 55-67, and col.4, lines 50-67).

14. As to claim 26, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said application is

a member of said plurality of applications (col.5, lines 1-20, col.6, lines 1-8, and col.7, lines 59-67).

15. As to claim 27, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said member comprises a subset of said plurality of applications (col.5, lines 1-20, col.6, lines 1-8, and col.7, lines 59-67).

16. As to claim 28, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said first signal comprises an operating system command to stop a process (col.4, lines 50-67); and said second signal comprise an operating system command to start a process (col.5, lines 40-60).

17. As to claim 29, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein each of said serving, sending, and determining steps are performed without modifying said application in any way (col.4, lines 27-37)

18. As to claim 30, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said client server provides a computational power for said stateless DTU and a state maintenance for said stateless DTU (col.5, lines 1-21, and col.5, lines 40-60).

19. As to claim 31, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, including a client server serving a plurality of applications to a stateless Desktop Unit (DTU) comprising: a filter; a resource (col.2, line1 to col.3, line 5); a first session associated with a user on a first stateless DTU; wherein said first session is disassociated with said first DTU, indicating that said first session is inactive (col.3, lines 35-47, and col.4, line 1-13); a first signal transmitted from said filter to at least one member of said plurality of applications indicating that said at least one member should stop consuming said resource (col.4, lines

38-49); a second signal transmitted from said filter to said at least one member indicating that said at least one member should resume consuming said resource (col.5, line 40-60).

20. As to claim 32, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said any stateless DTU comprises said first stateless DTU and a second stateless DTU (col.5, lines 1-21, and col.5, lines 40-60).

21. As to claim 34, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said client server comprises a first client server and a second client server and wherein said first and second signals are sent by said first client server comprising said filter.

22. As to claim 35, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said at least one member comprises a subset of said plurality of applications (col.5, lines 1-20, col.6, lines 1-8, and col.7, lines 59-67).

23. As to claim 36, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer program product comprising: a plurality of client servers having computer readable program code embodied therein for improving access to one or more resources on said plurality of servers comprising: computer readable program code configured to cause a stateless Desktop Unit (DTU) to improve access to one or more resources on at least one of said plurality of client servers serving a plurality of applications to said DTU comprising: computer readable program code configured to cause at least one of said plurality of client servers to determine when an application should become inactive (col.4, lines 38-67); Computer readable program code configured to cause at least one of said plurality of client servers to send a first signal to said application indicating that said application should stop or reduce consuming said one or more resources (col.5, lines 40-60, and col.4, lines 50-67); and computer readable program code configured to cause at

least one of said plurality of client servers to send a second signal to said application indicating that said application should resume or increase consuming said one or more resources (col.5, lines 40-60). Spilo does not teach determining when said application served from said client server should resume activity. However, Susai teaches the determining when said application served from client server should resume activity (col.4, lines 16-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the invention to combine the teachings of Spilo and to have an application served from client server should resume activity because it would have an efficient that can provide automatically function that can return to or begin again after interruption.

24. As to claim 37, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said computer readable program code configured to cause said client server to determine when said application should become inactive comprises computer readable program code configured to cause at least one of said plurality of client servers to determine when a session is no longer active by identifying when said stateless DTU is disassociated with said session (col.4, lines 38-67).

25. As to claim 38, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said computer readable program code configured to cause said server to determine when said application should resume activity comprises computer readable program code configured to cause at least one of said plurality of client servers to determine when said session becomes active by identifying when any DTU becomes re-associated with said session (col.4, lines 38-67, and col.5, lines 1-21).

26. As to claim 39, Spilo teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said first signal

and said second signal comprise operating system commands (col.4, lines 50-67).

27. Claims 24, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spilo et al., (hereinafter Spilo) U.S. Patent No. 6,298,422 and Susai et al., (hereinafter Susai) U.S. Patent No. 6,411,986 in view of Tushie et al., (hereinafter Tushie) U.S. Patent No. 6,014,748.

28. As to claim 24, and 33 Spilo and Susai do not teach the invention as claimed, wherein an identifier is used to cause the association and wherein identifier comprises a smart card. However, Tushie teaches an identifier causing the association is a smart card (col.11, liens 25-35, and col.14, lines 33-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the invention to combine the teachings of Spilo, Susai and Tushie to have an smart card includes in a communication system because it would have an efficient that can provide specific function that given it some kind of independent decision-making ability.

Conclusion

29. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

Art Unit: 2143

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

30. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

31. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Tammy T. Nguyen** who may be reached via telephone at **(703) 305-7982**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding After Final issues, please send it to **(703) 746-7238**. If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to **(703) 746-7239**. If you would like to send a Non-Official (draft) facsimile transmission the fax is **(703) 746-7240**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, **David Wiley**, may be reached at **(703) 308-5221**.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Director of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231.

Moreover, hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist, located on the **fourth floor of Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, Virginia**.

Tammy T Nguyen



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100